DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 120 EA 019 117

AUTHOR Kovas, Marcia Anne
TITLE A Comparison of Secondary School Student Performance in Attendance and Achievement with Relationship to the Use or Nonuse of a Restrictive and Punitive Administrative Control Policy for Attendance.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 99p.; Exit Project, Indiana University at South Bend, Summer 1986.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attendance Patterns; Average Daily Attendance; Comparative Analysis; *Discipline Policy; *Grade Prediction; High Schools; *High School Students; *Program Implementation; Research Methodology; School Policy; *Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

This study compares student populations between two high schools in an urban school district in Indiana and populations within the schools to determine the effects of a punitive attendance policy and the attendance patterns of various groups. The schools were differentiated by the factor of one school enforcing an attendance policy. Random samples were classified into student groups having high grades, low grades, high absences, low absences, high ability, and low ability. Literature research on attendance policies is reviewed in the study's second section. The third section discusses characteristics of students who are most likely to be absent. Responses of student groups to policy implementation are examined in section 4. Section 5 demonstrates the relationship of the literature to the study. Research findings include: (1) an attendance policy curbs absences during the first semester but not during the second; (2) an attendance policy does not affect grades earned; (3) a relationship between ability and attendance cannot be established; and (4) an attendance policy is not a factor in relating good attendance and high achievement. Recommendations include a longitudinal study of an attendance policy's effect on absences and achievement and an investigation that involves a greater variety of subgroups. The study includes 29 charts, 3 pages of references, and 3 appendices. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278120

A COMPARISON OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN ATTENDANCE AND ACHIEVEMENT WITH RELATIONSHIP TO THE USE OR NONUSE OF A RESTRICTIVE AND PUNITIVE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL POLICY FOR ATTENDANCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marcia Anne Kovas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MARCIA ANNE KOVAS

Graduate Student

Study Directed

by

CHARLES R. DUVALL, Ph.D.

EA 019 117

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the course S591 - Exit Project
Indiana University at South Bend
Summer, 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Problem and Definitions of Terms	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Hypotheses	3
	Significance of the Study	7
	Definitions of the Terms Used	7
	Limitations of the Study	8
II.	Review of the Literature	9
	Scope of the Problem	9
	Attendance Policies	10
	Characteristics of the Absentee	13
	Relationship to the Present Study	16
III.	Research Design and Procedures	18
	Sources of the Data	18
	Instrumentation	19
	Collection of the Data	20
	Treatment of the Data	21
	Statistical Procedure	24
IV.	Presentation and Analysis of the Data	25
	Sample Representation	25
	Statistical Procedure	26
	Analysis of the Data	26
	Summary of the Tests	42
V.	Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	54
	Summary	54

Conclusions..... 58

Implications..... 61

Recommendations for Future Study..... 61

Works Cited..... 62

Appendicies..... 65

A. Attendance Policy at Policy High School..... 66

B. Raw Data..... 72

C. List of Characteristics of the Absentee from the Literature..... 87

TABLES

Title		Page
4-1	Comparison of Students with High Grades in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences	28
4-2	Comparison of Students with Low Grades in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences	29
4-3	Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences	30
4-4	Comparison of Students with Low Ability in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences	31
4-5	Comparison of Students with High Absences in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades	32
4-6	Comparison of Students with Low Absences in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades	33
4-7	Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math Classes at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades	34
4-8	Comparison of Students with Low Ability in English and Math Classes at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades	35
4-9	Comparison of Students with High Grades in English and Math with Students with Low Grades in English and Math at PHS in Determining Absences	36
4-10	Comparison of Students with High Grades in English and Math with Students with Low Grades in English and Math at NPHS in Determining Absences	37
4-11	Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Ability in English and Math Classes at PHS in Determining Absences	38
4-12	Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Ability in English and Math Classes at NPHS in Determining Absences	39
4-13	Comparison of Students with High Absences in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Absences in English and Math Classes at PHS in Determining Grades	40
4-14	Comparison of Students with High Absences in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Absences in English and Math Classes at NPHS in Determining Grades	41

6-1 Comparison of Students with High Grades in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences..... 73

6-2 Comparison of Students with Low Grades in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences..... 74

6-3 Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences..... 75

6-4 Comparison of Students with Low Ability in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Absences..... 76

6-5 Comparison of Students with High Absences in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades..... 77

6-6 Comparison of Students with Low Absences in English and Math at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades..... 78

6-7 Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math Classes at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades..... 79

6-8 Comparison of Students with Low Ability in English and Math Classes at PHS and NPHS in Determining Grades..... 80

6-9 Comparison of Students with High Grades in English and Math with Students with Low Grades in English and Math at PHS in Determining Absences..... 81

6-10 Comparison of Students with High Grades in English and Math with Students with Low Grades in English and Math at NPHS in Determining Absences..... 82

6-11 Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Ability in English and Math Classes at PHS in Determining Absences..... 83

6-12 Comparison of Students with High Ability in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Ability in English and Math Classes at NPHS in Determining Absences..... 84

6-13 Comparison of Students with High Absences in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Absences in English and Math Classes at PHS in Determining Grades..... 85

6-14 Comparison of Students with High Absences in English and Math Classes with Students with Low Absences in English and Math Classes at NPHS in Determining Grades..... 86

FIGURES

Title		Page
4-1	Comparison of English Absences at PHS and NPHS.....	42
4-2	Comparison of Math Absences at PHS and NPHS.....	43
4-3	Comparison of English Grades at PHS and NPHS.....	44
4-4	Comparison of Math Grades at PHS and NPHS.....	45
4-5	English Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Grades and Low Grades.....	48
4-6	English Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Ability and Low Ability.....	48
4-7	Math Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Grades and Low Grades.....	49
4-8	Math Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Ability and Low Ability.....	49
4-9	English Grades Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Absences and Low Absences.....	50
4-10	Math Grades Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Absences and Low Absences.....	50
5-1	Comparison of Absences Between Similar Groups at PHS and NPHS.....	54
5-2	Comparison of Grades Between Similar Groups at PHS and NPHS.....	55
5-3	Comparison of Absences Between Dissimilar Achievement Groups within PHS and NPHS.....	56
5-4	Comparison of Absences Between Dissimilar Ability Groups within PHS and NPHS.....	56
5-5	Comparison of Grades Between Dissimilar Attending Groups within PHS and NPHS.....	58

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

Absenteeism is becoming an increasing problem in secondary schools throughout the country, particularly in urban areas (Birman and Natriello, 1978). According to William Brokowski (1978) members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals listed poor attendance as their most "perplexing problem" (p. 1) three times during the last decade. Researchers point out that the problem of absenteeism can take its toll on the individual, the schools and on society as well (Birman and Natriello, 1978).

School boards throughout the country have begun implementing attendance policies with the intention of curbing excessive absences. Many of these newly developed policies are in some way restrictive and punitive (Brokowski and Dempsey, 1979). A common feature of these policies is the "lowering of academic grades and the withholding of course credit for students who violate the provisions of the policy" (Brokowski, 1978, p. 1). Reports from administrators who have implemented this type of policy suggest that they are effective in increasing average daily attendance (ADA) at many high schools.

A selected urban school district in Indiana is the setting for this study. The school system in this city adopted a pilot attendance policy which was implemented on a trial basis at one of its five high schools during the 1984-85 school year. The community had a population of approximately 150,000 persons and the high school in question had an en-

rollment of approximately 1100 students during the academic year. The provisions of the policy specify limits for student absenteeism and prescribe reductions in course grades and loss of course credit for violators. The text of this policy can be found in Appendix A (pp. 66-71) of this study. In contrast to this high school, which will be called Policy High School (PHS) throughout the remainder of this study, other high schools in the city had no such policies.

During the 1985-86 academic year the selected school system began to consider implementing an attendance policy at all five of the high schools. According to Brokowski, "sound administrative practice dictates that policies be evaluated" (1978, p. 4). Brokowski asserted in his 1978 dissertation that administrators "want to know how effective a policy is in improving student attendance " (p. 5) and that they also should know how a policy affects academic performance as well (p. 5). Brokowski's ideas served as guidelines for the present study.

Another high school in the same city was used as a comparative sample in this study. This high school, which had an enrollment of approximately 1500 students during the academic year 1984-85 will be called No Policy High School (NPHS) throughout the remainder of this study.

Statement of the Problem

The main purpose of this study was to examine differences between selected populations at PHS and NPHS. The second purpose of this study was to examine differences between selected populations within the high schools.

The comparisons were made to determine the effects of a restrictive and punitive attendance policy and the attendance patterns of various groups. Other types of attendance policies exist which are neither restrictive nor punitive, but in this study the term "attendance policy" will mean those which are restrictive and punitive.

The random samples taken from each high school were classified into groups of students having: 1) high grades; 2) low grades; 3) high absences; 4) low absences; 5) high ability; 6) low ability.

The samples were also divided by semester. Comparisons were made to determine the validity of the null hypotheses stated in the following section.

Hypotheses

$H_0 1$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences of students with high grades in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences of students with high grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0 2$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences of students with low grades in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences of students with low grades in English and Math classes

at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0$3: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0$4: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0$5: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0$6: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math

classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0 7$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with high ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0 8$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0 9$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of days of absence among students with high grades in English and Math classes and the mean number of days of absence among students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where a restrictive and punitive administrative

control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

$H_0$10: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of days of absence in English and Math classes among students with high grades and the mean number of days of absence among students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0$11: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

$H_0$12: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

$H_0$13: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where a restrictive

and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

$H_0$14: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Significance of the Study

According to Brokowski (1978) attendance policies should be evaluated to determine not only their effect on attendance, but also their effect on other aspects of performance (p. 15). This study attempts to do this by comparing academic achievement (grades), as well as absences; and by evaluating an attendance policy's effect on both of these measures within various groupings of students at both PHS and NPHS.

Definitions of the Terms Used

ability (cognitive)--The mental functioning involved in perceiving, knowing, and understanding; sometimes measured through the use of problems involving relationships, sometimes restricted to performance in perceptual tasks (Good, 1973, p. 310).

academic achievement--Knowledge attained or skills developed in the school subjects, usually designated by test scores or by marks assigned by teachers, or both (Good, 1973, p. 7).

attendance--A school day during which a student is present for an entire school session under the guidance and direction of teachers (Good, 1973, p. 48).

average daily attendance--A statistic computed by the formula: the sum of the days attended by each student enrolled divided by the number of days school is in session (Good, 1973, p. 48).

restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance--An administrative strategy introduced for controlling attendance which involves the...lowering of academic grades and the withholding of course credit for students who violate the provisions of the policy (Brokowski, 1978, p. 1).

Limitations of the Study

The following were the limitations of the study:

1) The study was conducted ex post facto. Since the design of the study was not experimental (with all variables controlled) the findings cannot be attributed to a strict cause and effect relationship between the use of an attendance policy and student behavior.

2) Measured intelligence quotients (I.Q.) were not available for students in this study. In related research done on attendance policies, I.Q. scores were the measure used to determine student ability. In this study, the language and math stanine scores from the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Battery were substituted as a measure of ability. They were the only measures available in the records. A direct relationship between the two measures cannot be assumed.

3) The division of variables into ranges of high and low was done arbitrarily. A discussion of these divisions is found in Chapter 3.

4) The independent samples were unequal in size. In most instances, this variation did not affect the statistical procedures.

5) Student records from the 1983-84 school year were not available. Plans to carry out a longitudinal study using the same subjects had to be abandoned.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Related research and literature on attendance revealed four distinct aspects of the problem relevant to this study. The first section of this chapter discusses the scope of the problem. The second section of this chapter reviews attendance policies and their effectiveness in high schools throughout the country. In the third section the characteristics of students who are most likely to be absent or truant are discussed. In the fourth section, the response of various student groups to the implementation of a policy is examined. Section five shows the relationship of the literature to this study.

Scope of the Problem

According to much of the literature reviewed, the increase in high school absenteeism has become a nationwide phenomenon. Birman and Natriello in their article "Perspectives on Absenteeism in High Schools" (1978) noted that in large urban areas such as San Francisco 22 percent of all enrolled students in 1974 had accumulated ten or more unexcused absences in a single year. Out of 67 comprehensive high schools in New York, none reported average daily attendance rates of more than 84 percent in 1978. In a 1970 survey, 36 percent of the 517 high school principals in the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey reported average attendance figures of 89 percent.

Irregular attendance has been cited as a problem because it often is a precursor to dropping out of school. Scott Birdsong in his article

"Truancy, A Review of the Literature" (1980) noted Myrna Hrubec's 1973 study which found that the overall rates of attendance of eventual dropouts had grown worse from two years before withdrawal from school to the year of withdrawal.

Birman and Natriello (1978) asserted that absenteeism and dropping out can become a problem at three levels. The authors noted that the student, the schools, and society all pay a price for escalating absenteeism. The student who fails to get a high school degree handicaps himself in his quest for employment. The student who has not earned a diploma has not mastered the skills and knowledge which are necessary for satisfactory job performance. The schools also suffer from absenteeism. Robinson (1979) suggested that the problem of absenteeism makes the schools a mark for criticism, albeit unfair, in our society. Ryan (1978) also noted that schools suffer from absenteeism because government funding for schools is often based on ADA (Average Daily Attendance). High absenteeism can bring about a cutback in government dollars for the school. Finally, high absenteeism can result in both long term and short term problems for society. According to Birman and Natriello the short term problems are "delinquency and crime which occur when large numbers of adolescents are out of school and unemployed," and the long term problems are created by dropouts who have "failed to acquire basic competencies necessary for a productive adult life" (p. 31).

Attendance Policies

As a measure to curb absences that are excessive and the problems which go along with them, many secondary school administrators have

developed attendance policies which "typically restrict the number of student absences to specific limits and which impose penalties affecting course grades or credits" (Brokowski and Dempsey, 1979, p. 129). Brokowski and Dempsey cited that in a survey of administrators by the Connecticut Association of Secondary Schools (CASS), 80 percent of the principals reported that they had a formal attendance policy. Well over half of the policies (66 percent) were reported as effective, and 85 percent of the policies were in some way restrictive or punitive.

Nearly all of the attendance policies reviewed emphasized shifting accountability from the administration to the students. Robert Carruthers (1980) reported that Ellison High School had the best attendance record in Kileen, Texas, because of its policy which involved withholding credit. After seven absences a student was withdrawn from class. He had to make an appeal to the school attendance board for credit at that point. If a student was withdrawn from 50 percent of his classes, he was withdrawn from the school for the quarter.

Richard J. Konet (1980) also claimed that responsibility must be placed on the student. He talked about the Student Attendance Review Committee (SARC) at a high school in Westfield, New Jersey. The SARC comprised of teachers and administrators met daily during homeroom. Students who had an unauthorized absence had to meet the committee. They went on their own volition. Penalties were usually detentions. If the student failed to show up he/she was excluded from school. Konet claimed attendance rose to well above 90 percent.

Mary Childs (1979) also discussed a system which held that five absences that are unexcused meant the failure of a course. At Central High School in Georgia, students had to sign in to attend classes after an absence. After a fifth absence, the student had to meet with a review board to plead for a chance to earn credit in the class. Childs claimed that average daily attendance rose 6 percent.

Robert Byrne (1981), a former principal in New Jersey, talked about an attendance policy which brought average daily attendance up to 95 percent. Students were allowed six absences in a semester-long class and twelve in a year-long class. The absences, if excused, did not count against the total. Students could make a claim before a review board to appeal the rule in extreme circumstances. The penalty for exceeding the limit was withdrawal from class. Again, the merit of putting responsibility on the students was extolled in this article.

Richard Suprina (1979) stated that after the second illegal absence from a class a parent conference was scheduled. During the conference with student and parent, the criteria for maintaining enrollment in class was discussed and "an agreement is signed by all concerned" (p. 28). He emphasized, "should continuous legal attendance not be maintained, the student will be permanently withdrawn from the class." Absences, as noted earlier, decreased by two-thirds with the adoption of the policy.

Gerald Teachman (1979) who studied the Detroit School District, reported that "30 percent of the students in the Detroit High Schools will be absent from each class on an average day" (p. 204). His

strongest recommendation to the Detroit School System was that, "Schools must adopt attendance policies that lead to acceptance of personal responsibility on the part of the student for his attendance" (p. 205). He claimed that students exploit "September rules" which are seldom enforced after the beginning of the year (p. 205). Teachman stressed that administrators must design and enforce a policy which establishes strict penalties for students who decide to skip school.

A restrictive policy may involve legal complications. Zirkel and Gluckman (1982) noted that a student brought a class action suit against her school for withholding credit from her after she missed eight days in a class. Her statutory claim was based on state compulsory attendance and truancy laws. Her constitutional claim was based on due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution (p. 80).

McKnight and Hines (1980) noted that in recent cases, the courts have given schools the right to establish reasonable criteria for graduation, and have allowed them to include effort and conduct as part of a student's grade (p. 34). These rulings do allow for the establishment of a restrictive and punitive attendance policy. But the courts have warned that the punishment must not be unduly harsh or arbitrary. A clear definition of excessive absences, a formal published written policy, and a procedure for due process and appeal are also advised by the authors.

Characteristics of the Absentee

Characteristics of the absentee which were studied in this paper are found in this section. In Appendix C (pp. 87-91), a wider list is

presented.

Achievement level. According to four researchers, students who were frequently absent had lower grades than students who were infrequently absent. (Karweit, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979) and (Kooker, 1976 in Moos and Moos, 1977).

According to another study, students who were frequently absent showed less than expected learning gains (Jenne, 1973 in Moos and Moos, 1977).

Also, Don Rodgers (1980) discussed a school at which many students who missed twenty days of school or more during the ninth grade failed their tenth grade skills competency tests.

Ability level. Two researchers found that students who were low or average in measured levels of intelligence (I.Q.) were more often absent than those who had higher I.Q.'s (Levanto, 1975 in Elliot, 1979) and (Cook, 1954 in Birdsong, 1980).

In another study, students who were average or above average in intelligence were more often absent (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979).

Attendance Patterns. In one study, a researcher, Nancy Karweit (1975) found that students missed school more often at the end of the school year than they did at the beginning of the school year (in Elliott, 1979).

The Response of Students to an Attendance Policy

Brokowski (1978) measured the effects of a restrictive and punitive attendance policy used at New Milford, Connecticut High School

in 1978. He studied 666 secondary school students in attendance, achievement and behavior during a two year period. His intention was to compare these factors before and after the policy was in effect. He used analysis of variance procedures using a .05 level of significance to determine significant differences. He found that older students (juniors and seniors) with low I.Q.'s improved their performance most under the policy. The attendance of this group improved from 161 to 166 days out of a possible 180 days. The number of their course failings decreased from .94 to .34 courses failed.

Older students as a group also showed significant increases in academic average, from 79.91 to 81.48 percent and increased their participation in extra-curricular activities from 1.68 to 1.94 activities per student. In no group of the students did academic average significantly decrease. Brokowski emphasized that this last fact "seems to indicate that the penalty of credit denial or grade reduction was not actually imposed on the majority of students" (Brokowski and Dempsey, 1979, p. 130).

His implication was that the policy may have served as an effective deterrent by intimidating students. Most students, he implied, did not push the limit and therefore did not suffer the penalites of the system.

Brokowski found that students in the high I.Q. group did not show a significant increase or decrease in attendance or achievement after the policy was put in effect. Sex in this study was also not a significant factor.

The final significant finding of the Brokowski study is that students with low I.Q.'s demonstrated a "significant increase in the number of disciplinary suspensions they were issued when the policy was in operation" (p. 130). The suspension rate, according to Brokowski, doubled among these students. He attributes this to a "negative reaction to the pressure of attendance coerced by an attendance policy" (p. 130). No other group increased in disciplinary incidents.

Relationship to the Present Study

Related research showed that schools with attendance policies usually increased in their average daily attendance. Comparisons were made in this study between similar groups of students at PHS and NPHS to find if absences were lower at PHS.

Related research also indicated that students who were high achievers and/or who had high ability were usually better school attenders than those who were low achievers and/or who had low ability. Therefore, in this study, high achievers were compared with low achievers, and students with high ability were compared with students with low ability to see if this held true at both PHS and NPHS.

Finally, Brokowski (1978) said he could infer that most students do not suffer harsh academic penalties because the overall grade point average did not significantly decrease after the attendance policy was implemented. He also noted that juniors and seniors with low I.Q.'s increased in their grade points after the policy was implemented.

In this study, grades of each group of students at PHS and NPHS were compared to determine if significant differences existed. The spe-

cific focus of interest was to compare the grades of low ability students at both schools to determine if the grades of those at PHS were higher [in line with Brokowski's findings, 1978], and to compare the grades of students with high absences at both schools to determine if those at PHS had grades no lower than those at NPHS [Brokowski's implication, 1978].

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This chapter is divided into five sections. In the first section the sources of the data are explained. In the second section the instrumentation used in the study is discussed. The third section presents the procedures used to collect the data. The treatment of the data is explained in section four. The statistical procedures used in the study are described in section five.

Sources of the Data

The data analyzed in this study were collected from the school files located in the main administration building of the school system in which Policy and No Policy High schools are a part. These files had all been stored in the main computer data bank operated by the school system. They contained all the data needed on students at PHS and NPHS from which the following were extracted: 1) the number of absences in the fall semester 1984 English and Math classes, and the number of absences in the spring semester 1985 English and Math classes for all student records requested; 2) the grades earned in the fall semester 1984 English and Math classes, and the grades earned in the spring semester 1985 English and Math classes for all student records requested; and 3) the stanine values for total language ability and total math ability from the results of the 1983-84 Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Test Battery given to all students in the corporation for all student records requested.

This study involved only students who were juniors at both high schools in the school year 1984-85. Only students who were enrolled during both semesters were used in the study. This step was taken to prevent distortion of the findings. Eliminating all records which had incomplete attendance or academic records was necessary for this reason.

Instrumentation

The only instrument used in the study was the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Level I, for grades 12-9 published in 1981. Stanine scores used in this paper as a measure of ability were obtained from this test which was given to the sample of students in 1983.

Several reviews from the Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Mitchell, 1985) mentioned the following attributes of the test.

1) Validity. Lorrie Shepard claimed the test's objective matches those of state curriculum guides and textbook series well (p. 386). She mentioned that the amount of reading was low with the Math tests, and that inference and problem solving were included in the higher levels of the test. There were nine levels of the test to more accurately match students' abilities to the test given.

2) Reliability. Robert Linn claimed that the "detailed reporting of standard errors of measurement by level of scaled score clearly reveals the range of scores where results are most dependable" (p. 384). Shepard noted that national standardization and norming procedures were extensive (p. 388), and that norming was done twice a year.

Both reviewers noted that the Item Response Theory (IRT) was used in test development, scoring and scaling. Linn mentioned that standard

errors of measurement were reported as a function of scaled scores based on the IRT results (p. 384). He noted this was a "distinct advantage over a single estimate for each test" (p. 384).

Linn also mentioned that conventional reliability estimates have not been reported yet, but that the KR-20 coefficients will be released in the Test's Final Report (p. 384). He adds, "their absence is no great loss because standard errors of measurement are of greater value" (p. 384). He also said the CTBS test results are more comprehensive and potentially useful than those provided by most of the publishers of achievement test batteries" (p. 384).

3) Norms. The fall and spring tests were normed on a sample of 250,000 students. Linn noted that there was a minimum of 3,028 to 18,992 students tested for each given combination of grade, test level, and test date (p. 384).

4) Scales. The test scores were given in percentiles, stanines (which were used in this study), grade equivalents, normal curve equivalents, and scale scores (p. 384). A disadvantage of the IRT metric with scale scores is that variability increases with increases in grade level (Linn, p. 384). That is also why Shepard questioned the high praise the testmakers give to the IRT (p. 387).

Collection of the Data

Collection of the data followed a three step process. The first step of the process involved getting a computer-generated random sample of 60 percent of the juniors enrolled at both Policy and No Policy High Schools during the 1984-85 school year. Restrictions mandated by the

Indiana State Department Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 were carefully adhered to. All identifying information including student names, addresses, parent names, telephone numbers, student identification numbers, and birthdates were eliminated from the sample.

The second step of the collection of the data involved the elimination of all incomplete records. After eliminating records from both schools, PHS had the smallest sample with 123 cases. At this point, a random selection was made from the NPHS sample to make the groups equivalent. Random numbers were obtained from The Rand Corporation's A Million Random Digits and 100,000 Normal Deviates (1955).

The third step of the collection of the data involved the use of a "double blind" technique to further disguise the identity of the cases in the samples. Using numbers from Rand the cases in each sample were renumbered again and reordered. This "double blind" technique eliminated the possible identification of the students.

Treatment of the Data

Three distinct aspects were involved in the treatment of the data. In the first place the information requested for the study had to be numerically coded. Secondly, decisions had to be made to deal with inconsistencies found in the data. Finally, files (groups of data) had to be created in order to isolate the variables needed for each particular test.

1) Coding the data. All information had to be coded in order to use the Stats Plus statistics program for the Apple II computer for analysis of the data. All data used in the study were given a numerical

value. Student grades were coded on a scale from 0 = F to 4 = A. This is also the grading scale used by the school system being studied.

Ranges for the variables also had to be set prior to the testing of the data. Due to a lack of related research which dealt specifically with the variables being used in this study, the ranges set to divide the data into high and low groups were arbitrary. The ranges set were as follows: 1) Absences, 0-10 = low, 11-90 = high; 2) Grades, 0-1 = low, 2-4 = high; 3) Ability (stanines), 1-4 = low, 5-9 = high. Dividing data into two groups rather than three groups with more precise ranges was done for the statistical purpose of providing for a more reliable outcome with a more likely chance of getting statistically significant results.

2) Inconsistencies in the data. During the collection of the data, decisions were made to account for inconsistencies found in the student records. These inconsistencies were handled in the following ways.

Inconsistencies in math:

A) Some students took computer programming as well as a traditional math course. Both are in the math department. The traditional math course was counted as their math grade.

B) Computer programming was counted as a math grade if no other math course was taken.

C) Business math counted as a math grade because it was listed under the math department.

D) Computer applications and word processing were not counted as math because they were listed under the business department.

Inconsistencies in English:

A) If a traditional English class and a remedial (basic skills) English class were taken during the same semester, the traditional English class was counted as the English grade.

B) If a remedial (basic skills) English class was the only English class taken, it was counted as the English grade.

C) If a student was taking two traditional English classes at the same time (either to repeat a failed class or to acquire additional credits) the course which was on grade level was counted.

3) Creation of data files. Data were entered into the Stats Plus software program through random access files. Two random access files were created. One random access file was used to store all of the data gathered on PHS. The second random access file was used to store all of the information gathered on NPHS.

The next step in the creation of the files was the division of the data. The variables which were to be compared with each other were isolated in sequential files created from each of the random access files. The comparison of independent groups from the sequential files formed the basis for testing data in this study. The use of sequential files made it possible to compare groups of unequal numbers. This feature was important because it was noted that more students at No Policy High School took math than students at Policy High School. Not all students in either group took English for both fall and spring semesters. The numbers of students with high ability differed at both schools, the numbers of students with high grades differed at both

schools, and the numbers of students with high absences differed at both schools.

Statistical Procedure

T-tests were used to compare means of scores among the independent samples being studied. Stephen Madigan and Virginia Lawrence, authors of the Stats Plus General Statistics Package for the Apple II (1982) state that in using this test, "samples may be equal or unequal in size for the independent groups option" (p. 56). They also say, "the program uses a pooled/weighted estimate of error for the independent groups design" (p. 56). The T-test provides the means and standard deviations, t-value, exact p-value and the estimate of error used in the test (Madigan and Lawrence, 1982). Additional information about the statistical procedures used in this study is located in the second section of Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data that were collected. This chapter is divided into four sections. Section one describes the sample representation. Section two discusses the statistical procedures used in evaluating each hypothesis. Section three is a restatement of each hypothesis with a tabular presentation of the findings of each statistical test. Section four is the summary of the results of the tests.

Sample Representation

The sample for this study was obtained by drawing a random sample of students who were juniors at PHS and NPHS during the school year 1984-1985. Each sample contained 123 cases. The total number of student cases used in the study totalled 246. Only cases that included complete data for the variables identified were used. The total enrollment of Policy High School during the 1984-1985 fall semester was 1139 students, and during the 1984-1985 spring semester was 1046 students. The total enrollment of the No Policy High School during the 1984-1985 fall semester was 1465, and during the 1984-1985 spring semester was 1582. Students who entered or withdrew at any time during the year of of the study, or who had failed to take the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills test battery (the measure used in this study to determine ability) did not have complete data for the variables, and consequently, were not included. This procedure was followed to prevent distortion of

the findings. Sample representation cut by semester, ability, grades, and absences used for each of the hypotheses tested are found in Appendix B on pages 72 to 86 of this study.

Statistical Procedure

The statistical method used to test the data in the study was independent sample t-tests. The t-test is used to test differences between two small samples from normal populations (Goldman and Weinberg, 1985). The results of each test which are included in the next section of this chapter include t(v)--the number of degrees of freedom in each comparison--and the p value for each test.

In this study, the results of the comparisons were considered significant if the p value for the test was less than or equal to .05. This was the criterion set for rejection of the null hypothesis. Tables in Appendix B include the number of cases being compared in each test, the mean value of each variable being compared, and the standard deviation of the sample being compared.

Analysis of the Data

The results of the testing of 14 null hypotheses are included in this section of the chapter. Each null hypothesis is restated in this section, and the results of each test are presented in tabular form. The results of the tests are starred according to their levels of significance. Test results obtained which have a p value of equal to or less than .05 are starred (*), test results obtained which have a p value of equal to or less than .01 are starred (**), test results obtained which have a p value of equal to or less than .005 are starred

(***), and test results obtained which have a p value of equal to or less than .001 are starred (****). Test results obtained which are greater than .05 are not considered significant in this study and are not starred. A key which represents the sample groups being compared is listed for each test. A statement of the test results is included at the bottom of the page. A summary and consolidation of the statistical tests is included in the fourth section of this chapter.

External Comparisons:

$H_0 1$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences of students with high grades in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences of students with high grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-1

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math HIG = High Grades
Sample: PENGHIG1 = PHS--English high grades first semester

	PENGHIG1	PENGHIG2	PMATHIG1	PMATHIG2
NENGHIG1	T(196)(-4.731)****			
NENGHIG2		T(185)(-1.400)		
NMATHIG1			T(151)(-3.188)***	
NMATHIG2				T(141)(-.317)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with high grades at a school where a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance is in operation had statistically significant fewer absences than students with high grades at a school with no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance in both English and Math classes in the first semester. There was no difference between them in the second semester.

H_02 There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences of students with low grades in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences of students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-2

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math LOG = Low Grades
Sample: PENGLOG1 = PHS--English low grades first semester

	PENGLOG1	PENGLOG2	PMATLOG1	PMATLOG2
NENGLOG1	T(44)(-2.929)**			
NENGLOG2		T(52)(-4.161)****		
NMATLOG1			T(43)(-.563)	
NMATLOG2				T(45)(-2.110)*

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with low grades at a school where a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance is in operation had statistically significant fewer absences than students with low grades at a school with no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance in English classes during semester one and semester two, and in Math classes during semester two. The comparison of students in first semester Math showed no difference.

$H_0$3: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-3

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy E7HI = High English stanine scores
A = Absences MOHI = High Math stanine scores
1 and 2 = Semester
Sample: NE7HIA1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, absences first semester

	NE7HIA1	NE7HIA2	NMOHIA1	NMOHIA2
PE7HIA1	T(170)(3.804)****			
PE7HIA2		T(168)(1.739)		
PMOHIA1			T(159)(3.262)***	
PMOHIA2				T(156)(.742)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with high ability at a school with a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance have statistically significant fewer absences than do students with high ability at a school with no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance in the first semester Math and English classes. Students in second semester Math and English classes showed no difference.

$H_0 4$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-4

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester
Sample: NE7LOA1 = NPHS--English low stanine scores, absences first semester

E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores

	NE7LOA1	NE7LOA2	NMOLOA1	NMOLOA2
PE7LOA1	T(69)(2.199)*			
PE7LOA2		T(67)(2.783)**		
PMOLOA1			T(33)(-.023)	
PMOLOA2				T(28)(1.309)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with low ability at a school with a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance had statistically significant lower absences than students with low ability at a school with no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance in their English classes during both semesters. Students in Math did not show a difference in either semester.

H_05: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-5

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math HIA = High Absences
Sample: PENGHIA1 = PHS--English high absences first semester

	PENGHIA1	PENGHIA2	PMATHIA1	PMATHIA2
NENGHIA1	T(30)(.394)			
NENGHIA2		T(43)(.250)		
NMATHIA1			T(22)(-.336)	
NMATHIA2				T(27)(-.402)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis accepted.

$H_0 6$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-6

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math LOA = Low Absences
Sample: PENGLOA1 = PHS--English low absences first semester

	PENGLOA1	PENGLOA2	PMATLOA1	PMATLOA2
NENGLOA1	T(210)(.199)			
NENGLOA2		T(194)(-1.204)		
NMATLOA1			T(172)(-.249)	
NMATLOA2				T(159)(-1.771)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis accepted.

$H_0 7$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with high ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-7

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
G = Grades
1 and 2 = Semester
Sample: NE7HIG1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, grades, first semester

E7HI = High English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores

	NE7HIG1	NE7HIG2	NMOHIG1	NMOHIG2
PE7HIG1	T(170)(-1.431)			
PE7HIG2		T(168)(.163)		
PMOHIG1			T(159)(-.451)	
PMOHIG2				T(156)(.747)

$p < .05$*
$p < .01$**
$p < .005$***
$p < .001$****

Null Hypothesis accepted.

$H_0$8: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-8

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
G = Grades
1 and 2 = Semester
Sample: NE7LOG1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, grades, first semester

E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOLO = High Math stanine scores

	NE7LOG1	NE7LOG2	NMOLOG1	NMOLOG2
PE7LOG1	T(69)(-.947)			
PE7LOG2		T(67)(-.838)		
PMOLOG1			T(33)(-.697)	
PMOLOG2				T(28)(-.798)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis accepted.

Internal Comparisons:

$H_0$9: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of days of absence among students with high grades in English and Math classes and the mean number of days of absence among students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Table 4-9

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy
Eng = English, Mat = Math
1 and 2 = Semester
HIG = High Grades
LOG = Low Grades
Sample: PENGHIG1 = PHS--English high grades first semester

	PENGHIG1	PENGHIG2	PMATHIG1	PMATHIG2
PENGLOG1	T(120)(-3.519)****			
PENGLOG2		T(119)(-3.468)***		
PMATLOG1			T(87)(-3.626)****	
PMATLOG2				T(88)(-4.434)****

$p < .05$*
$p < .01$**
$p < .005$***
$p < .001$****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with high grades have statistically significant lower absences at a school with a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance than students with low grades at the same school. This holds true in both English and Math classes during semester one and semester two.

$H_0$10: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of days of absence among students with high grades in English and Math classes and the mean number of days of absence among students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-10

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. N = No Policy
Eng = English, Mat = Math
1 and 2 = Semester
HIG = High Grades
LOG = Low Grades
Sample: NENGHIG1 = NPHS--English high grades first semester

	NENGHIG1	NENGHIG2	NMATHIG1	NMATHIG2
NENGLOG1	T(120)(-6.854)****			
NENGLOG2		T(118)(-8.113)****		
NMATLOG1			T(107)(-1.777)	
NMATLOG2				T(98)(-6.579)****

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with high grades have statistically significant lower absences in English classes during both semesters, and in Math classes during the second semester. There was no difference in the first semester Math comparison.

$H_0$11: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Table 4-11

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester

E7HI = High English stanine scores
E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores

Sample: PE7HIA1 = PHS--English high stanine scores, absences first semester

	PE7HIA1	PE7HIA2	PMOHIA1	PMOHIA2
PE7LOA1	T(120)(-2.160)*			
PE7LOA2		T(119)(-1.857)		
PMOLOA1			T(87)(-2.190)*	
PMOLOA2				T(88)(-.648)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with high ability have statistically significant lower absences in both English and Math classes during the first semester than do students with low ability at a school with a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance in operation . This does not hold true for students in English and Math classes in the second semester.

$H_0$12: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-12

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. N = No Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester
E7HI = High English stanine scores
E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores
Sample: NE7HIA1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, absences first semester

	NE7HIA1	NE7HIA2	NMOHIA1	NMOHIA2
NE7LOA1	T(119)(-1.916)			
NE7LOA2		T(116)(-3.488)***		
NMOLOA1			T(105)(.325)	
PMOLOA2				T(96)(.982)

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with high ability have statistically significant lower absences than students with low ability at a school with no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance in the second semester English class only. Students in English class during the first semester, and students in Math classes during the first and second semester showed no difference.

$H_0$13: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Table 4-13

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy
Eng = English, Mat = Math
1 and 2 = Semester
HIA = High Absences
LOA = Low Absences
Sample: PENGHIA1 = PHS--English high absences first semester

	PENGHIA1	PENGHIA2	PMATHIA1	PMATHIA2
PENGLOA1	T(120)(-2.580)*			
PENGLOA2		T(119)(-4.070)****		
PMATLOA1			T(87)(-2.545)*	
PMATLOA2				T(88)(-3.662)****

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with low absences at a school with a restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance have grades that are statistically significantly higher than students at the same school with high absences in English classes and Math classes during both semesters.

$H_0$14: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 4-14

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. N = No Policy; 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math; HIA = High Absences
LOA = Low Absences
Sample: NENGHIA1 = NPHS--English high absences, first semester

	NENGHIA1	NENGHIA2	NMATHIA1	NMATHIA2
NENGLOA1	T(120)(-5.217)****			
NENGLOA2		T(118)(-7.576)****		
NMATLOA1			T(107)(-2.421)*	
NMATLOA2				T(98)(-4.906)****

p < .05*
p < .01**
p < .005***
p < .001****

Null Hypothesis rejected. Students with low absences at a school with no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance have grades that are statistically significantly higher than students at the same school with high absences in both English and Math classes during both semesters.

Summary of the Tests

External tests:

The following figures graphically display the results of the external tests:

Figure 4-1: Comparison of English Absences at PHS and NPHS

Students with:	Semester One			Semester Two		
	PHS	v	NPHS	PHS	v	NPHS
High grades	↓	$R_J H_0 1$	↑	--	$A H_0 1$	--
Low grades	↓	$R_J H_0 2$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 2$	↑
High ability	↓	$R_J H_0 3$	↑	--	$A H_0 3$	--
Low ability	↓	$R_J H_0 4$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 4$	↑

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept

↓ Signifies the group of students who had fewer absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had greater absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-2: Comparison of Math Absences at PHS and NPHS

Students with:	Semester One			Semester Two		
	PHS	v	NPHS	PHS	v	NPHS
High grades	↓	$R_J H_0 1$	↑	--	$AH_0 1$	--
Low grades	--	$AH_0 2$	--	↓	$R_J H_0 2$	↑
High ability	↓	$R_J H_0 3$	↑	--	$AH_0 3$	--
Low ability	--	$AH_0 4$	--	--	$AH_0 4$	--

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had fewer absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had greater absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-3: Comparison of English Grades at PHS and NPHS

Students with:	Semester One			Semester Two		
	PHS	v	NPHS	PHS	v	NPHS
High absences	--	$AH_0 5$	--	--	$AH_0 5$	--
Low absences	--	$AH_0 6$	--	--	$AH_0 6$	--
High ability	--	$AH_0 7$	--	--	$AH_0 7$	--
Low ability	--	$AH_0 8$	--	--	$AH_0 8$	--

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had lower grades in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had higher grades in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

— Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-4: Comparison of Math Grades at PHS and NPHS

Students with:	Semester One			Semester Two		
	PHS	v	NPHS	PHS	v	NPHS
High absences	--	$AH_0 5$	--	--	$AH_0 5$	--
Low absences	--	$AH_0 6$	--	--	$AH_0 6$	--
High ability	--	$AH_0 7$	--	--	$AH_0 7$	--
Low ability	--	$AH_0 8$	--	--	$AH_0 8$	--

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had lower grades in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had higher grades in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Results of External Comparisons in Determining Absences:

English absences, semester one [Figure 4-1]. In semester one, each of the four groups compared between PHS and NPHS showed a signifi-

cant difference in absences. Students enrolled at PHS had significantly fewer absences in all four cases.

English absences, semester two [Figure 4-1]. In semester two, only students with low ability and low grades had statistically significant fewer absences at PHS. In the other two comparisons, no difference was found.

Math absences, semester one [Figure 4-2]. Students with high grades and high ability had statistically significant fewer absences at PHS. In the other two comparisons no difference was found.

Math absences, semester two [Figure 4-2]. In the second semester, students with low grades had statistically significant fewer absences at PHS. In the other three comparisons, no difference was found.

Summary of Math and English Comparisons for Absences. Students enrolled at PHS showed fewer absences than students enrolled at NPHS in six [or 75 percent] of the eight comparisons made in the first semester. In the second semester, students at PHS had fewer absences in three [or 38 percent] of the eight comparisons. In no comparison did students at NPHS have fewer absences.

Results of External Comparisons in Determining Grades:

English grades, semester one [Figure 4-3]. There were no significant differences between any of the groups compared.

English grades, semester two [Figure 4-3]. There were no significant differences between any of the groups compared.

Math grades, semester one [Figure 4-4]. There were no significant differences between any of the groups compared.

Math grades, semester two [Figure 4-4]. There were no significant differences between any of the groups compared.

Internal tests:

The following figures graphically display the results of the internal tests:

Figure 4-5: English Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Grades and Low Grades

	Semester One			Semester Two		
	High Grades		Low Grades	High Grades		Low Grades
PHS	↓	$R_J H_0 9$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 9$	↑
NPHS	↓	$R_J H_0 10$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 10$	↑

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had fewer absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had greater absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-6: English Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students Students with High Ability and Low Ability

	Semester One			Semester Two		
	High Ability		Low Ability	High Ability		Low Ability
PHS	↓	$R_J H_0 11$	↑	--	$AH_0 11$	--
NPHS	--	$AH_0 12$	--	↓	$R_J H_0 12$	↑

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had fewer absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had greater absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-7: Math Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Grades and Low Grades

	Semester One			Semester Two		
	High Grades		Low Grades	High Grades		Low Grades
PHS	↓	$R_J H_0 9$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 9$	↑
NPHS	--	$AH_0 10$	--	↓	$R_J H_0 10$	↑

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had fewer absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had greater absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-8: Math Absences Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Ability and Low Ability

	Semester One			Semester Two		
	High Ability		Low Ability	High Ability		Low Ability
PHS	↓	$R_J H_0 11$	↑	--	$AH_0 11$	--
NPHS	--	$AH_0 12$	--	--	$AH_0 12$	--

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies the group of students who had fewer absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

↑ Signifies the group of students who had greater absences in each comparison where there was a significant difference.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-9: English Grades Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Absences and Low Absences

	Semester One			Semester Two		
	High Absences		Low Absences	High Absences		Low Absences
PHS	↓	$R_J H_0 13$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 13$	↑
NPHS	↓	$R_J H_0 14$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 14$	↑

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies group of students in comparison who had significantly lower grades.

↑ Signifies group of students in comparison who had significantly higher grades.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Figure 4-10: Math Grades Compared within PHS and NPHS for Students with High Absences and Low Absences

	Semester One			Semester Two		
	High Absences		Low Absences	High Absences		Low Absences
PHS	↓	$R_J H_0 13$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 13$	↑
NPHS	↓	$R_J H_0 14$	↑	↓	$R_J H_0 14$	↑

Key. R_J = Reject
A = Accept
↓ Signifies group of students in comparison who had significantly lower grades.

↑ Signifies group of students in comparison who had significantly higher grades.

-- Shows no significant difference between the groups.

Results of Internal Comparisons in Determining Absences:

English absences, PHS, semester one. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-5], and students with high ability had fewer absences than students with low ability [Figure 4-6].

English absences, PHS, semester two. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-5]. No difference was found in ability [Figure 4-6].

English absences, NPHS, semester one. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-5]. No difference was found in ability [Figure 4-6].

English absences, NPHS, semester two. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-5], and students with high ability had fewer absences than students with low ability [Figure 4-6].

Math absences, PHS, semester one. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-7], and students with high ability had fewer absences than students with low ability [Figure 4-8].

Math absences, PHS, semester two. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-7]. No difference was found in ability [Figure 4-8].

Math absences, NPHS, semester one. No differences in ability or achievement groups were found [Figures 4-7, 4-8].

Math absences, NPHS, semester two. Students with high grades had fewer absences than students with low grades [Figure 4-7]. No differences were found in ability [Figure 4-8].

Summary of Internal Tests Comparing Absences in English and Math within PHS and NPHS

Students with high grades had significantly fewer absences than students who had low grades in seven (88 percent) of the eight comparisons made. The breakdown of these seven comparisons includes four at PHS [Figures 4-5 and 4-7], and three at NPHS [Figures 4-5 and 4-7].

Students with high ability had significantly fewer absences than students with low ability in three (38 percent) of the eight comparisons made. The breakdown of these three comparisons include two at PHS [Figures 4-6 and 4-8], and one at NPHS [Figures 4-6 and 4-8].

Results of Internal Comparisons in Determining Grades:

English grades, PHS, semester one. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-9].

English grades, PHS, semester two. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-9].

English grades, NPHS, semester one. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-9].

English grades, NPHS, semester two. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-9].

Math grades, PHS, semester one. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-10].

Math grades, PHS, semester two. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-10].

Math grades, NPHS, semester one. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-10].

Math grades, NPHS, semester two. Students with low absences had higher grades than students with high absences [Figure 4-10].

Summary of Internal Tests Comparing Grades in English and Math within PHS and NPHS

Students with low absences had higher grades in all comparisons (100 percent of them) made with students who had high absences.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

External test summary. The results of the comparisons of similar groups of students at PHS and NPHS are depicted in Figure 5-1 and 5-2 below:

Figure 5-1: Comparison of Absences Between Similar Groups at PHS and NPHS

	Semester One		Semester Two	
	PHS	NPHS	PHS	NPHS
High grades/English	↓	↑	--	--
Low grades/English	↓	↑	↓	↑
High ability/English	↓	↑	--	--
Low ability/English	↓	↑	↓	↑
High grades/Math	↓	↑	↓	↑
Low grades/Math	--	--	--	--
High ability/Math	↓	↑	--	--
Low ability/Math	--	--	--	--

Key. ↑ This group had significantly higher absences.
↓ This group had significantly fewer absences.
-- This showed no difference.

In Figure 5-1, six of eight groups compared (75 percent) in the first semester showed significant results. In each of these comparisons, students at PHS had fewer absences. Also, in Figure 5-1,

three of the eight groups compared (38 percent) in the second semester showed significant results. In each of these comparisons students at PHS had fewer absences.

Figure 5-2: Comparison of Grades Between Similar Groups at PHS and NPHS

	Semester One		Semester Two	
	PHS	NPHS	PHS	NPHS
High absences/English	--	--	--	--
Low absences/English	--	--	--	--
High ability/English	--	--	--	--
Low ability/English	--	--	--	--
High absences/Math	--	--	--	--
Low absences/Math	--	--	--	--
High ability/Math	--	--	--	--
Low ability/Math	--	--	--	--

Key. ↑ This group had significantly higher grades.
↓ This group had significantly lower grades.
-- This showed no difference.

In Figure 5-2, none of the eight groups compared in either semester between PHS and NPHS showed significant differences in grades.

Internal test summary. The results of comparisons of absences between dissimilar groups of students at PHS and NPHS are depicted in Figures 5-3 and 5-4 below.

Figure 5-3: Comparison of Absences Between Dissimilar Achievement Groups within PHS and NPHS

	Semester One		Semester Two	
	High Grades	Low Grades	High Grades	Low Grades
PHS English	↓	↑	↓	↑
NPHS English	↓	↑	↓	↑
PHS Math	↓	↑	↓	↑
NPHS Math	--	--	↓	↑

Key. ↑ This group had significantly higher absences.

↓ This group had significantly lower absences.

-- This showed no difference.

Figure 5-4: Comparison of Absences Between Dissimilar Ability Groups Within PHS and NPHS

	Semester One		Semester Two	
	High Grades	Low Grades	High Grades	Low Grades
PHS English	↓	↑	--	--
NPHS English	--	--	↓	↑
PHS Math	↓	↑	--	--
NPHS Math	--	--	--	--

Key. ↑ This group had significantly higher absences.

↓ This group had significantly lower absences.

-- This showed no difference.

Figure 5-3 shows four comparisons made in semester one, and four comparisons made in semester two between high achieving and low achieving groups within PHS and NPHS. In seven out of eight (88 percent) of these comparisons, students who earned higher grades had fewer absences than those who earned lower grades.

All four of the comparisons made within PHS (100 percent) showed this result, while three of the four comparisons made within NPHS (75 percent) showed this result.

Figure 5-4 shows four comparisons made in semester one, and four comparisons made in semester two, between high ability and low ability groups within PHS and NPHS.

In three out of eight (38 percent) of these comparisons, students who had higher ability had fewer absences than those who had lower ability.

Two of the comparisons made within PHS (50 percent) showed this result, and one of the comparisons made within NPHS (25 percent) showed this result.

The results of comparisons of grades between dissimilar groups of students at PHS and NPHS are depicted in Figure 5-5 below:

Figure 5-5: Comparison of Grades Between Dissimilar Attending Groups Within PHS and NPHS

	Semester One		Semester Two	
	High Absences	Low Absences	High Absences	Low Absences
PHS English	↓	↑	↓	↑
NPHS English	↓	↑	↓	↑
PHS Math	↓	↑	↓	↑
NPHS Math	↓	↑	↓	↑

Key. ↑ This group had significantly higher grades.

↓ This group had significantly lower grades.

-- This showed no difference.

Figure 5-5 shows four comparisons made in semester one, and four comparisons made in semester two between frequently absent and seldom absent groups of students within PHS and NPHS. In all of these (100 percent) comparisons, students who had higher absences had significantly lower grades than students who had lower absences.

Conclusions

Effectiveness of an Attendance Policy/External Tests:

1) Students at PHS had significantly fewer absences in six of eight comparisons (75 percent) made with similar counterparts at NPHS in the first semester. This finding suggests that the implementation of an attendance policy does have a positive impact on curbing absences in the first semester.

2) Students at PHS had significantly fewer absences in three of eight comparisons (38 percent) made with similar counterparts at NPHS in the second semester. This finding suggests that the positive impact of an attendance policy on curbing absences is not as strong in the second semester as it is in the first.

3) There were no significant differences in grades earned in any of the comparisons made between similar groups at the two schools. This finding suggests that an attendance policy does not have an impact on grades earned.

Characteristics of Absentees at PHS and NPHS/Internal Tests:

1) In seven out of eight comparisons made (88 percent) within both schools, students who earned higher grades had fewer absences than those who earned lower grades. This finding suggests that there is a significant relationship between attendance and grades. This study does not provide a basis for making an assumption on what this relationship is.

2) In three out of eight comparisons made (38 percent) within both schools, students who had higher ability had fewer absences than those who had lower ability. This finding does not provide a strong basis for concluding that there is a significant relationship between ability and attendance.

3) In comparing absences between high and low achievement groups within PHS and NPHS, four of the comparisons (100 percent) within PHS showed high achievers to have fewer absences, while three of the comparisons (75 percent) within NPHS showed high achievers to have fewer absences.

There was a strong relationship between high achievement and good attendance at both schools. This finding suggests that an attendance policy was not among the factors which was responsible for this relationship.

4) In comparing absences between high and low ability groups within PHS and NPHS, two of the comparisons (50 percent) within PHS showed high ability students to have fewer absences, while one of the comparisons (25 percent) within NPHS showed high ability students to have fewer absences.

There was no strong relationship between high ability and good attendance at either school. This finding also suggests that an attendance policy was not among the factors which was responsible for this relationship.

5) In all comparisons made (100 percent) within both schools, students who had higher absences had significantly lower grades than students who had lower absences. This finding also suggests that there is a significant relationship between attendance and grades. This study does not provide a basis for making an assumption on what this relationship is.

6) In comparing grades between groups of students who had high and low absences within PHS and NPHS, four of the comparisons (100 percent) within PHS showed better attenders to have better grades, and four of the comparisons (100 percent) within NPHS also showed better attenders to have better grades.

There was a strong relationship between good attendance and high achievement at both schools. This finding suggests that an attendance policy was not among the factors which was responsible for this relationship.

Implications

1) The implementation of an attendance policy may result in improved attendance for students, especially in the first semester.

2) Strategies other than an attendance policy should be devised to improve student achievement (grades) since the findings of this study indicate that students do not earn higher grades when such policies are implemented.

Recommendations for Future Study

1) A longitudinal study should be made to determine the effects an attendance policy has on student absences and achievement over a several-year period.

2) A study which includes a greater variety of subgroups for examination (including samples of minorities, drug users, non-drug users, students from large families and small families, students from poor homes and wealthy homes [see Appendix C]) would be useful.

3) Replication of this study in order to confirm or reject its findings would also be useful.

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

A. BOOKS

Goldman, R., and Weinberg, J. Statistics An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1985.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. (Third Edition). New York: McGraw-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Mitchell, James V., Jr. The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

Rand Corporation. A Million Random Digits and 100,000 Normal Deviates. New York: Free Press, 1955.

B. DISSERTATIONS

Brokowski, William Walter. "A Comparison of Secondary School Student Performance in Attendance, Achievement and Related Variables Prior to and During a Restrictive and Punitive Administrative Control Policy for Attendance." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Connecticut, 1978.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Saltsman, S. School Attendance in the State of Maryland. Maryland Department of Pupil Personnel (August 20, 1979): 49-62.

D. COMMERCIAL MANUALS

Madigan, S., and Lawrence, V. Stats Plus, A General Statistics Package for the Apple II. Northridge, Ca.: Human Systems Dynamics, 1982.

E. PERIODICALS

Billington, B. "Patterns of Attendance and Truancy, A Study of Attendance and Truancy Amongst First Year Comprehensive School Pupils." Education Review 30.3 (November 1978): 221-225.

Birdsong, S. "Truancy, A Review of the Literature." The Journal of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers 24.2 (March 1980): 121-128.

Birman, B., and Natriello, G. "Perspectives on Absenteeism in High Schools." Journal of Research and Development in Education 11.4 (1978): 29-38.

Brokowski, W., and Dempsey, R. "Attendance Policies and Student Performance." The Clearing House 53.3 (November 1979): 129-130.

Byrne, R. "Capturing the Elusive Student." NASSP Bulletin 65.445 (May 1981): 29-33.

Brown, D. "Truants, Families, and Schools: A Critique of the Literature on Truancy." Educational Review 34.3 (November 1983): 225-235.

Carruthers, R. "An Attendance Policy That Works." NASSP Bulletin 64.440 (December 1980): 117-120.

Childs, M. "Making Students Accountable for Absences." NASSP Bulletin 63.418 (April 1979): 119-120.

Duke, D., and Meckel, A. "Student Attendance Problems and School Organization." Urban Education 15.3 (October 1980): 325-357.

Elliott, Peggy. "Where Are the Students and the Teachers?" Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning 55.2 (September 1979): 18-29.

Galloway, D., Ball, T., and Seyd, R. "School Attendance Following Legal or Administrative Action for Unauthorized Absence." Educational Review 33 (1981): 53-65.

Goldman, J. "Flexible Modular Scheduling." Urban Education 18.2 (July 1983): 191-228.

Hebert, L. "Keeping Children in School." Journal of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers 23.2 (May 1979): 106-108.

Heffez, J. "Employment and the High School Dropout." NASSP Bulletin 64.439 (November 1980): 85-90.

Konet, R. "An Attendance System that Works, SARC." NASSP Bulletin 64.441 (March 1983): 103-106.

Little, L., and Thompson, R. "Truancy, How Parents and Teachers Contribute." The School Counselor 30.4 (March 1983): 285-291.

McKnight, M., and Hines, S. "Read this Before Adopting a Policy on Student Attendance." The Executive Educator 2.9 (September 1980): 34, 38.

Moos, R., and Moos, B. "Classroom Social Climate and Student Absences and Grades." Journal of Educational Psychology 70.2 (April 1978): 263-269.

Nielsen, A. "Psychosocial Aspects of Truancy in Early Adolescence." Adolescence 14.54 (Summer 1979): 313-326.

Robinson, D., "Our Secondary Schools Have Not Succeeded...Not Yet." Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning 55.2 (Spring 1979): 18-29, 67-79.

Rodgers, D., "Stepping Up School Attendance." NASSP Bulletin 64.440 (December 1980): 122-124.

Ryan, J. "Costs and Trends in Unexcused Elementary School Absenteeism." Planning and Changing 9.4 (Winter 1978): 228-235.

Suprina, R. "Cutting Down on Student Cutting." NASSP Bulletin 63.416 (February 1979) 27-31.

Teachman, G. "In School Truancy in Urban Schools, The Problem and a Solution." Phi Delta Kappan 61.3 (November 1979): 203-205.

Zirkel, P., and Gluckman, I. "Academic Penalties for Absences." Principal 61.3 (January 1982): 60-61.

APPENDIX A

ATTENDANCE POLICY AT POLICY HIGH SCHOOL

ATTENDANCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

All students are expected to attend school regularly and to be on time for classes in order to derive maximum benefit from the instructional program, and to develop habits of punctuality, self-discipline, and responsibility. It has been shown that students who have good attendance records generally achieve higher grades, enjoy school more, and are much more employable after leaving high school. Likewise, there is a direct relationship between poor attendance and class failure.

Parents are to call the office between 7:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. on the day the student is absent from school. This will insure that the son/daughter is marked excused. The phone number is extension #26. Calls will be accepted from a parent or legal guardian only.

Any student shall be granted an opportunity to earn credit for any course so long as his/her absence does not exceed a maximum of eight (8) days per semester. These are not to be construed as free absences.

When a student reaches 4 absences, the teacher or teachers must inform the guidance department. The guidance counselor will work closely with the office of the assistant principal to determine the cause for the absences.

The student will be counseled by his/her counselor, and a letter will be sent to the parents informing them of the student's absenteeism. The counselor will also check with the rest of the student's teachers to determine if he/she has the same record in their classes.

The same procedures will be followed when the student reaches his sixth (6) absence.

Any student accumulating more than 8 absences from a semester course will be withdrawn from that class with a WF and placed into a study hall or alternative program.

A student who accumulates 8 absences in a second class will be recommended for expulsion from or removed from school for the remainder of the semester. It is recommended that the student enroll in an alternative educational program.

Exceptions (Days not counted in the Eight Day Limit)

If a student brings a doctor or dental statement showing that he/she has been under a doctor's care for the amount of the absence, then those days or parts of days shall not count toward the allowed eight (8) absences. This statement must be brought when the student returns to school. No parental statement will be accepted in place of a doctor's statement. Special arrangements will be considered if a student is under constant medical care.

Kinds of Absences:

Excused - An absence is excused when a student misses school because of:

1. Illness of child
2. Death in the family
3. Medical and dental appointments
4. Religious observance
5. Court appointment
6. Any other absences authorized by State Law

Unexcused - An unexcused absence will be given when the reason for the absence fails to qualify as one of the above reasons. Students receiving unexcused absences will not be permitted the privilege of make-up work for credit, and will receive no credit for the period of unexcused absence. It is recommended that the student make up work missed in order to keep up with the class. The student's name will appear on the daily absentee sheet with Unexcused typed beside it.

Planned or Pre-excused

Planned absences are arranged through the office of the assistant principal. Such absences are granted in advance only when a student knows he/she must be absent for other than an excused reason. Examples: family trip, court appearance, college visitation, and employment interview. The student must present a written note from the parent which identifies the dates of absence and the reason. A Planned Absence Form will then be issued so that the student can inform his/her teachers. The completed form with signatures must be returned to the office prior to the planned absence, preferably one week before the absence. Failure to arrange for such absences in advance will result in the recording of an unexcused absence.

Truancy - Truancy is the willful absence from school, or a single class, without the permission or consent of school personnel. A parent conference can be requested at any time in cases involving truancy from school. Truancy is considered a most serious offense. Three truancies in any semester will result in the removal of the student from that class, with a WF, or if for complete days, from school for the remainder

of the semester. In case of truancy no work will be allowed to be made up.

There are no authorized Skip Days at Policy High School. Any senior or other student that violates this rule will be considered truant and class grades will be affected. On a day where information or the absence pattern indicates an unauthorized skip day, a doctor's statement will be requested for a student to receive an excused absence.

TARDINESS POLICY

Almost all Tardiness is avoidable. Tardiness disrupts not only your school program but also the progress of your class group. Habits of punctuality and promptness are in a measure the main elements of reliability. Lack of such habits cannot help being detrimental to a successful life. Future employers and college entrance boards have a high regard for promptness. Plan to arrive early - allow for emergencies. If a student is (15) fifteen minutes late, this will be counted as an unexcused absence from class, unless the student is detained by a staff member.

Students reporting late to class need to get a tardy admit in the Attendance Office. All students are required to be in their seats when the bell rings. Students receiving an excessive amount of tardies will be required to make up appropriate time.

Three (3) tardies to any one class will be counted as one (1) unexcused absence to that class.

APPENDIX B

RAW DATA

H_01: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences of students with high grades in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences of students with high grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-1

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math HIG = High Grades
Sample: PENGHIG1 = PHS--English high grades first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PENGHIG1	101	2.980	3.513
NENGHIG1	97	5.763	4.701
PENGHIG2	90	4.833	4.353
NENGHIG2	97	5.763	4.701
PMATHIG1	71	2.958	3.196
NMATHIG1	82	5.256	5.296
PMATHIG2	64	4.609	3.130
NMATHIG2	79	4.810	4.203

H_02 There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences of students with low grades in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences of students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-2

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math LOG = Low Grades
Sample: PENGLOG1 = PHS--English low grades first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PENGLOG1	21	6.238	5.262
NENGLOG1	25	12.280	8.122
PENGLOG2	31	8.194	5.443
NENGLOG2	23	21.435	16.602
PMATLOG1	18	6.444	5.090
NMATLOG1	27	7.444	6.272
PMATLOG2	26	9.423	7.212
NMATLOG2	21	15.429	12.114

$H_0 3$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-3

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester
E7HI = High English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores
Sample: NE7HIA1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NE7HIA1	91	5.549	4.981
PE7HIA1	81	2.988	3.659
NE7HIA2	89	6.764	7.344
PE7HIA2	81	5.123	4.462
NMOHIA1	98	5.602	5.447
PMOHIA1	63	3.095	3.416
NMOHIA2	92	6.609	7.950
PMOHIA2	66	5.788	4.941

$H_0$4: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-4

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester
Sample: NE7LOA1 = NPHS--English low stanine scores, absences first semester

E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NE7LOA1	30	7.900	7.897
PE7LOA1	41	4.634	4.548
NE7LOA2	29	14.103	15.221
PE7LOA2	40	6.850	5.461
NMOLOA1	9	5.000	3.240
PMOLOA1	26	5.038	4.634
NMOLOA2	6	9.833	4.021
PMOLOA2	24	6.583	5.707

$H_0 5$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-5

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math HIA = High Absences
Sample: PENGHIA1 = PHS--English high absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PENGHIA1	9	1.556	1.236
NENGHIA1	23	1.391	.988
PENGHIA2	17	1.294	1.047
NENGHIA2	28	1.214	1.031
PMATHIA1	9	1.556	.726
NMATHIA1	15	1.667	.816
PMATHIA2	13	1.077	1.115
NMATHIA2	16	1.250	1.183

H_06: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-6

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math LOA = Low Absences
Sample: PENGLOA1 = PHS--English low absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PENGLOA1	113	2.522	1.070
NENGLOA1	99	2.495	.896
PENGLOA2	104	2.471	1.114
NENGLOA2	92	2.641	.820
PMATLOA1	80	2.375	.933
NMATLOA1	94	2.415	1.149
PMATLOA2	77	2.286	1.099
NMATLOA2	84	2.571	.948

$H_0 7$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with high ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-7

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
G = Grades
1 and 2 = Semester
E7HI = High English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores
Sample: NE7HIG1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, grades, first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NE7HIG1	91	2.495	.923
PE7H1G1	81	2.704	.993
NE7HIG2	89	2.618	.911
PE7HIG2	81	2.593	1.116
NMOHIG1	98	2.367	1.161
PMOHIG1	63	2.444	.876
NMOHIG2	92	2.435	1.062
PMOHIG2	66	2.303	1.136

$H_0 8$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with low ability in English and Math classes when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation and the mean grades earned by students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-8

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS AND NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. P = Policy, N = No Policy
G = Grades
1 and 2 = Semester
E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores
Sample: NE7LOG1 = NPHS--English low stanine scores, grades, first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NE7LOG1	30	1.700	1.022
PE7LOG1	41	1.951	1.161
NE7LOG2	29	1.517	.911
PE7LOG2	40	1.725	1.086
PMOLOG1	9	1.667	.707
NMOLOG1	26	1.923	1.017
PMOLOG2	6	1.167	1.169
NMOLOG2	24	1.583	1.139

$H_0 9$: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of days of absence among students with high grades in English and Math classes and the mean number of days of absence among students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Table 6-9

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT PHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy, 1 and 2 = Semester
Eng = English, Mat = Math HIG = High Grades
LOG = Low Grades
Sample: PENGHIG1 = PHS--English high grades first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PENGHIG1	101	2.980	3.513
PENGLOG1	21	6.238	5.262
PENGHIG2	90	4.833	4.353
PENGLOG2	31	8.194	5.443
PMATHIG1	71	2.958	3.196
PMATLOG1	18	6.444	5.090
PMATHIG2	64	4.609	3.130
NMATLOG2	26	9.423	7.212

$H_0$10: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of days of absence among students with high grades in English and Math classes and the mean number of days of absence among students with low grades in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-10

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW GRADES IN ENGLISH AND MATH AT NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. N = No Policy
Eng = English, Mat = Math
1 and 2 = Semester
HIG = High Grades
LOG = Low Grades
Sample: NENGHIG1 = NPHS--English high grades first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NENGHIG1	97	4.588	3.848
NENGLOG1	25	12.280	8.122
NENGHIG2	97	5.763	4.701
NENGLOG2	23	21.435	16.602
NMATHIG1	82	5.256	5.296
NMATLOG1	27	7.444	6.272
NMATHIG2	79	4.810	4.203
NMATLOG2	21	15.429	12.114

$H_0$11: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school when a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Table 6-11

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester

E7HI = High English stanine scores
E7LO = = Low English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores

Sample: PE7HIA1 = PHS--English high stanine scores, absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PE7HIA1	81	2.988	3.659
PE7LOA1	41	4.634	4.548
PE7HIA2	81	5.123	4.462
PE7LOA2	40	6.850	5.461
PMOHIA1	63	3.095	3.416
PMOLOA1	26	5.038	4.634
PMOHIA2	66	5.788	4.941
PMOLOA2	24	6.583	5.702

$H_0$12: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean number of absences among students with high ability in English and Math classes and the mean number of absences among students with low ability in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-12

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABILITY IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT NPHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. N = No Policy
A = Absences
1 and 2 = Semester
E7HI = High English stanine scores
E7LO = Low English stanine scores
MOHI = High Math stanine scores
MOLO = Low Math stanine scores

Sample: NE7HIA1 = NPHS--English high stanine scores, absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NE7HIA1	91	5.549	4.981
NE7LOA1	30	7.900	7.897
NE7HIA2	89	6.764	7.344
NE7LOA2	29	14.103	15.221
NMOHIA1	98	5.602	5.447
NMOLOA1	9	5.000	3.240
NMOHIA2	92	6.609	7.950
NMOLOA2	6	9.833	4.021

$H_0$13: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where a restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance is in operation during semesters one and two.

Table 6-13

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABSFNCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT PHS IN DETERMINING ABSENCES

Key. P = Policy
Eng = English, Mat = Math
1 and 2 = Semester
HIA = High Absences
LOA = Low Absences
Sample: PENGHIA1 = PHS--English high absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
PENGHIA1	9	1.556	1.236
PENGLOA1	113	2.552	1.070
PENGHIA2	17	1.294	1.047
PENGLOA2	104	2.471	1.114
PMATHIA1	9	1.556	.726
PMATLOA1	80	2.375	.933
PMATHIA2	13	1.077	1.115
PMATLOA2	77	2.286	1.099

$H_0$14: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean grades earned by students with high absences in English and Math classes and the mean grades earned by students with low absences in English and Math classes at a high school where there is no restrictive and punitive administrative control policy for attendance during semesters one and two.

Table 6-14

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES WITH STUDENTS WITH LOW ABSENCES IN ENGLISH AND MATH CLASSES AT NPHS IN DETERMINING GRADES

Key. N = No Policy
Eng = English, Mat = Math
1 and 2 = Semester
HIA = High Absences
LOA = Low Absences
Sample: NENGHIA1 = NPHS--English high absences first semester

Chart	No	Mean	SD
NENGHIA1	23	1.391	.988
NENGLOA1	99	2.495	.896
NENGHIA2	28	1.214	1.031
NENGLOA2	92	2.641	.820
NMATHIA1	15	1.667	.816
NMATLOA1	94	2.415	1.149
NMATHIA2	16	1.250	1.183
NMATLOA2	84	2.571	.948

APPENDIX C

LIST OF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ABSENTEE FROM THE LITERATURE

Extrinsic factors. The research has shown that family type, employment, transportation to school, attitudes and beliefs, availability of peer groups, choice of school curriculum, type of school organization and use of drugs can influence absenteeism.

A. Family type:

Students who are most likely to be absent come from:

Large families (Frankel, 1969 in Birdsong, 1980)

Unstable or broken homes (Nielson and Gerber, 1979) (Frankel, 1969 in Birdsong, 1980) (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

Families headed by parents with little education (Nielson and Gerber, 1979) (Johnson, 1972 in Birdsong, 1980)

Families suffering from multiple stresses (Nielson, 1979)

Families which overprotect or overindulge (Little and Thompson, 1983)

Families in which both parents work (Frankel, 1969 in Birdsong, 1980)

B. Employment:

Students who are most likely to be absent are not employed (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979) (Heffez, 1980)

C. Transportation to school:

Students who are most likely to be absent rode the bus to school (Karweit, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

D. Attitudes and beliefs:

Students who are most likely to be absent:

Claim no religion (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

Could think of no adult they admired (Nielson and Gerber, 1979)

Found school boring and uninteresting (Jacobsen, 1973 in Birdsong, 1980) (Herbert, 1979)

E. Availability of peer groups:

Students who are most likely to be absent:

Skipped school with friends (Rosenthal, 1971 in Birdsong, 1980) (Nielson and Gerber, 1979)

F. Choice of school curriculum:

Students who are most likely to be absent:

Are enrolled in the general program (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979) (Graybeal, 1964 in Birdsong, 1980)

Are nonparticipants in school activities (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

G. School organization:

Poorly managed schools contribute to absenteeism (Duke and Meckel, 1980)

Flexible scheduling may decrease absenteeism (Goldman, 1983)

H. Drug use:

Students who use drugs are more likely to be absent (Nielson and Gerber, 1979)

Intrinsic factors. The research has shown that race, age, ability level, achievement level, sex and personality can influence absenteeism.

A. Race:

Black students are absent more than Caucasian students (Rodgers, 1980) (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

B. Age:

Older students are more often absent (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

Ninth graders are more often absent (Teachman, 1979)

C. Ability level:

Students low or average in IQ are more often absent (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Cook, 1954 in Birdsong, 1980)

Students who are average or above average in intelligence are more often absent (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979) (Md. St. Dept. of Ed., 1963)

D. Achievement level:

Students who are more often absent earn lower grades (Karweit, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979) (Kooker, 1976 in Moos and Moos, 1977)

Students who are more often absent show less than expected learning gains (Jenne, 1973 in Moos and Moos, 1977)

Students who miss 20 days of school may not have mastered basic grade level competencies (Rodgers, 1980)

E. Sex:

Girls were found to be absent most in grades 9-11 (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

Boys were found to be absent most in grade 12 (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

Sex was not a significant factor in two studies (Nielson and Gerber, 1979) (Billington, 1978)

F. Personality:

Students with poor personality ratings were absent more often (Levanto, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

Patterns of behavior in absentees. Several studies focused on patterns of behavior common in students who are often absent. Students are most often absent:

A. At the end of the school year (Karweit, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

B. On Mondays and Fridays (Karweit, 1975 in Elliott, 1979) (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979)

C. On rainy days (Karweit, 1975 in Elliott, 1979)

D. On days after vacations (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979)

E. During the first period class (Rodgers, 1980) (Teachman, 1979)

F. Who do not often eat breakfast (Gillies, 1976 in Elliott, 1979)

G. During required academic courses (Rodgers, 1980)

Some researchers found patterns of behavior emerging over a period of time in absentees. Myrna Hrubec (1973) found that the overall rates of attendance of eventual dropouts had grown worse from two years before withdrawal to the year of withdrawal. William Myer (Montgomery County Public Schools, 1971) found that the absence rates of eventual dropouts steadily increased from grade eight to grade twelve. By the twelfth grade 80 percent of the dropouts were absent 30 or more days per year (both from Birdsong, 1980).

MARCIA ANNE KOVAS

608 Park Avenue
South Bend, Indiana 46616

(219) 234-7961

Employment:

Secondary English and Journalism Teacher
James Whitcomb Riley High School, South Bend, Indiana -- August, 1984 to present.

Secondary English and Journalism Teacher
Marian High School, Mishawaka, Indiana -- August, 1983 to May, 1984.

Secondary English and Journalism Teacher
Howe Military School, Howe, Indiana -- August, 1982 to May, 1983.

Substitute Teacher in Secondary English
South Bend Community School Corporation -- South Bend, Indiana -- March,1981 to May, 1982.

Advertising Copy Writer
JLTC, Inc., Tucson, Arizona -- August, 1980 to March, 1981.

Reporter, Copy Editor Intern
South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Indiana -- Summers, 1977, 1978, 1979.

Education:

Certification in Secondary English -- February, 1984.
Indiana University at South Bend
South Bend, Indiana.

Bachelor of Arts in American Studies -- May, 1980.
University of Notre Dame
South Bend, Indiana

LaSalle High School -- June, 1976.
South Bend, Indiana.

Reason for Topic:

Attendance had become a concern in some of the courses I had been teaching. This was a particular concern in the remedial and basic level classes. At the same time, attendance as a concern had been noted on the national level among educators. It was my intent to find out how effective punitive measures are in curbing this problem.